

## **REMARKS**

### **SUMMARY**

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The rejections of claims 1-52 were maintained by the BPAI. In response, Applicants now amend claims 1, 10, 12, 16, 31-32, and 38, and cancel claims 11, 19, 23-30, 41, and 45-52. Accordingly, claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-22, 31-40, and 42-44 remain pending in the Application.

### **DOUBLE-PATENTING**

1. In “Double Patenting,” item 14 on page 6 of the final Office Action dated August 10, 2005, claims 1-52 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-22, 24-30, 33, 35-38, 41-63, 66-75, 77-80, 83 and 84 of copending Application No. 10/082,807 (hereinafter ‘807) which was filed on the same day as the instant application and is owned by the same entity.

Applicants will, upon issuance of either ‘807 or the instant application, submit the necessary Terminal Disclaimer for the remaining application. Thus, there will be no double patenting.

2. In “Double Patenting” item 15 on page 7 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 1-4, 10-12, 15-17, 22-24, 26, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39 41, 44-46 and 48 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-8, 19-23, 26, 27, 31-36, 38, 39, 43, and 44 of copending Application No. 10/784,492 (hereinafter ‘492) which was filed after the instant application.

Applicants will, upon issuance of either ‘492 or the instant application, submit the necessary Terminal Disclaimer for the remaining application. Thus, there will be no double patenting.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102,” item 18 on page 9 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22, 38, 39, and 44 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by “Using WebLogic Enterprise JavaBeans” by BEA Systems (hereinafter “WebLogic”) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The rejection of claim 11 is obviated by its cancellation.

**Claims 1, 4, and 10**

Amended claim 1 teaches a “method of specifying a stateful web service comprising:

first facilitating, by an integrated development environment of a computing device, a user in providing a source code representation of at least a portion of web service logic, the logic including one or more methods;

second facilitating, by the integrated development environment of the computing device, the user in identifying one of said one or more methods to be exposed as part of the stateful web service; and

in response to user input, automatically specifying, by the integrated development environment of the computing device, one or more declarative annotations, the declarative annotations, when recognized by a compiler, causing the compiler to generate one or more persistent components to maintain conversational state related to the identified method.”

In contrast, WebLogic fails to teach or suggest an integrated development environment that, in response to user input, automatically specifies declarative annotations that, when recognized by a compiler, cause the compiler to generate one or more persistent components to maintain conversational state related to an identified method. Rather, WebLogic simply teaches a framework for the development and deployment of EJBs. In WebLogic, a user/developer may either obtain or program EJBs, which may include business logic to perform a number of methods. WebLogic further teaches that the developer may create a “deployment descriptor”, which WebLogic teaches to be a text file which

accompanies an EJBBean and which may define implementation specific parameters for the EJBBean. EJBBeans and their deployment descriptors are then deployed within the WebLogic framework and compiled.

In the above-identified final Office Action, the Examiner equates the web service logic and method of claim 1 to the EJBBean and its methods, and reads the “deployment descriptor” on the declarative annotations of claim 1.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to indicate that the declarative annotations are automatically specified by the integrated development environment in response to user input. WebLogic does not teach the automatic specification of declarative annotations in response to user input, but rather teaches that deployment descriptors may either be obtained with the EJBBeans or manually specified by the developer. In neither case does WebLogic disclose the automatic specification of deployment descriptors in response to user inputs. Thus, even assuming that the web service logic and method of claim 1 equate to the EJBBean and its methods, the deployment descriptors of WebLogic do not read on the declarative annotations of amended claim 1.

Additionally, the deployment descriptors of amended claim 1 do not “when recognized by a compiler, causing the compiler to generate one or more persistent components to maintain conversational state related to the identified method,” as is claimed in amended claim 1. The only persistent components in WebLogic, are the EJBBeans themselves, as the Examiner acknowledges in the above-identified Office Action. And the EJBBeans are provided with the deployment descriptors in WebLogic, not generated in response to recognition of deployment descriptors. In fact, the deployment descriptors of WebLogic simply serve to set EJBBean parameters for a specific implementation. Thus, while deployment descriptors may customize an EJBBean, they do not cause a compiler to generate an EJBBean.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is not anticipate by WebLogic under §102.

Claims 4 and 10 depend from amended claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 4 and 10 are not anticipated by WebLogic under §102.

Claims 16-17, 22, 38-39, and 44

Amended claim 16 teaches in “a procedural programming environment, a method of generating a stateful web service, the method comprising:

reading on one or more computing devices a segment of procedural source code representing at least a portion of the web service;

parsing on one or more computing devices the segment of source code to identify the presence of one or more declarative annotations identifying an associated method within the segment as being stateful;

generating on one or more computing devices one or more object codes defining one or more publicly accessible service components based at least in part upon the source code;

generating on one or more computing devices meta-data based at least in part upon the one or more declarative annotations;

associating on one or more computing devices the meta-data with the one or more object codes; and

instantiating on one or more computing devices one or more queues to temporarily store one or more requests for the identified method based at least in part upon the one or more declarative annotations further identifying the associated method as being a buffered method.”

In contrast, WebLogic does not disclose “instantiating on one or more computing devices one or more queues to temporarily store one or more requests for the identified method based at least in part upon the one or more declarative annotations further identifying the associated method as being a buffered method,” as is claimed in amended 16. Rather, WebLogic teaches a framework for developing and deploying EJBs, that framework described in greater detail above.

In fact, the Examiner acknowledged in the above-identified final Office Action that WebLogic does not disclose the instantiation of one or more queues, that limitation taken from claim 19. Rather, the Examiner asserted that the combination of WebLogic and Pagé (citation below) suggests the limitations of claim 19 (and thus of amended claim 16).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Even assuming that Pagé teaches “one or more queues to temporarily store one or more requests for the identified method” (a point which Applicants do not concede), nothing in either Pagé or WebLogic discloses or suggests that such queues be instantiated “based at least in part upon the one or more declarative annotations further identifying the associated method as being a buffered method”, as is claimed by amended claim 16. The deployment descriptors of WebLogic, which the Examiner reads on the declarative annotations of claim 16, do not cause the instantiation or generation of anything, much less the instantiation of a queue. Rather, as described above, the deployment descriptors of WebLogic simply customize the EJBs for an implementation.

Accordingly, amended claim 16 is not anticipated by WebLogic under §102.

Amended claim 38 recites limitations similar to those of claim 16 and, accordingly, is not anticipated by WebLogic under §102 for at least the same reasons.

Claims 17, 22, 39, and 44 depend from amended claim 16 and 38, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 17, 22, 39, and 44 are not anticipate by WebLogic under §102.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

1. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 20 on page 13 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 2 and 3 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic as applied to claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22, 38, 39 and 44 above, and further in view of “EJBDoclet,” December 21, 2000, by dreamBean Software (hereinafter “EJBDoclet”).

EJBDoclet does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic. Accordingly, claim 1 remains patentable over WebLogic and EJBDoclet, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claims 2 and 3 are patentable over WebLogic and EJBDoclet, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

2. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 21 on page 14 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 5-8, 18, 23-25, 28-30, 40, 45-47, and 50-52 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic as applied to claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22, 38, 39 and 44 above, and further in view of “Enterprise JavaBeans” by Monson-Haefel (hereinafter “Monson-Haefel”).

The rejections of claims 23-25, 28-30, 45-47, and 50-52 are obviated by their cancellation.

Monson-Haefel does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic. Accordingly, claims 1, 16, and 38 remain patentable over WebLogic and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 5-8, 18, and 40 depend from claims 1, 16, and 38, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claims 5-8, 18, and 40 are patentable over WebLogic and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

3. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 22 on page 19 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 9, 19 and 41 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic as applied to claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22, 38, 39 and 44 above, and further in view of prior art of record U.S. Patent 5,812,768 to Pagé, et al. (hereinafter “Pagé”).

The rejections of claims 9, 19, and 41 are obviated by their cancellations.

4. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 23 on page 20 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 12, 31 and 34 have been rejected as being unpatentable over

WebLogic as applied to claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22, 38, 39 and 44 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,230,160 to Chan, et al. (hereinafter “Chan”).

Amended claim 31 recites limitations similar to those of amended claim 1, and thus is patentable over WebLogic for at least the reasons given above.

Chan does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic. Accordingly, claims 1 and 31 remain patentable over WebLogic and Chan, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 12 and 34 depend from claims 1 and 31, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claims 12 and 34 are patentable over WebLogic and Chan, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

5. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 24 on page 21 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 13, 20 and 42 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic as applied to claim 1, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22, 38, 39 and 44 above, and further in view of the “Background of the Invention” section appearing on pages 1-3 of the originally filed specification (hereinafter “BOTI”).

BOTI does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic. Accordingly, claims 1, 16, and 38 remain patentable over WebLogic and BOTI, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 13, 20 and 42 depend from claims 1, 16, and 38, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claims 13, 20 and 42 are patentable over WebLogic and BOTI, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

6. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 25 on page 22 of the above-identified final Office Action, claim 14 has been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic and BOTI as applied to claims 13, 20 and 42 above, and further in view of Pagé.

Pagé does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic and BOTI. Accordingly, claim 13 remains patentable over WebLogic, BOTI, and Pagé, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 14 depends from claim 13, incorporating its limitations.

Accordingly, claim 14 is patentable over WebLogic, BOTI, and Pagé, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

7. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 26 on page 22 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 15, 21, 26, 27, 43, 48 and 49 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic and BOTI as applied to claims 13, 20 and 42 above, and further in view of Monson-Haefel.

The rejections of claims 26-27 and 48-49 are obviated by their cancellations.

Monson-Haefel does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic and BOTI. Accordingly, claims 13, 20, and 42 remain patentable over WebLogic, BOTI, and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 15, 21, and 43 depend from claims 13, 20, and 42, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claim 15, 21, and 43 are patentable over WebLogic, BOTI, and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

8. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 27 on page 24 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 32 and 33 have been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic and Chan as applied to claims 12, 31, and 34 above, and in further view of EJBDoclet.

EJBDoclet does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic and Chan. Accordingly, claim 31 remains patentable over WebLogic, Chan, and EJBDoclet, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claims 32-33 depend from claim 31, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claims 32-33 are patentable over WebLogic, Chan, and EJBDoclet, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

9. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 28 on page 24 of the above-identified final Office Action, claim 35 has been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic and Chan as applied to claim 12, 31 and 34 above, and further in view of BOTI.



BOTI does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic and Chan. Accordingly, claim 31 remains patentable over WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 35 depends from claim 31, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 35 is patentable over WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

10. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 29 on page 24 of the above-identified final Office Action, claim 36 has been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic, Chan and BOTI above, and in further view of Pagé.

Pagé does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI. Accordingly, claim 35 remains patentable over WebLogic, Chan, BOTI, and Pagé, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 36 depends from claim 35, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 36 is patentable over WebLogic, Chan, BOTI, and Pagé, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

11. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 30 on page 24 of the above-identified final Office Action, claim 37 has been rejected as being unpatentable over WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Monson-Haefel.

Monson-Haefel does not cure the deficiencies of WebLogic, Chan, and BOTI. Accordingly, claim 35 remains patentable over WebLogic, Chan, BOTI, and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above. Claim 37 depends from claim 35, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 37 is patentable over WebLogic, Chan, BOTI, and Monson-Haefel, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-22, 31-40, and 42-44 are solicited. As a result of the amendments made herein, Applicant submits that claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-22, 31-40, and 42-44 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: April 19, 2007

by: /Robert C. Peck/  
Robert C. Peck  
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.  
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97222  
Telephone: 503-222-9981